

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12-14, 17, 18, 20, 22-28, 30-32, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 41 are pending in this application with Claims 2, 20, 38, 39, and 41 being independent. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 2, 20, 38, 39, and 41 and canceled Claims 43-45.

Claims 39, 41, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With respect to Claims 39 and 41, Applicant's have amended those claims to attend to the matters noted in the Office Action as given rise to the rejection. Claims 43-45 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2, 4-10, 17, 18, 20, 22-28, 30-32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,557,017 (Venable) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,563 (Kawamoto et al.), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0005045 (Tanimoto) and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0085767 (Epstein et al.). Applicants traverse this rejection.

As recited in independent Claim 2, Applicants' invention is directed to an image forming apparatus that processes data described in a predetermined descriptive language,

which includes XML or HTML and in which in no description order is defined for commands included in the image forming information. A reading module reads and obtains image forming information from the data described in the predetermined descriptive language and an image forming information interpreting module interprets the image forming information obtained by the reading module. The image forming information includes a trimming command and the interpreting module interprets the obtained trimming command. Furthermore, the interpreting module detects both the trimming command and a command other than the trimming command, wherein the other command may include any of a flipping processing command, a rotation processing command, and an image aspect ratio maintaining processing command. The processing is performed such that the trimming command is executed prior to execution of the other command.

Independent Claim 38 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 20.

As recited in independent Claim 39, Applicants' invention is directed to an image forming apparatus which interprets a plurality of commands, which are described in XML, HTML or SVG data, to process forming of an image. The apparatus reads the plurality of commands, which include at least one of a trimming command, an enlarging command, and a rotating command. The plurality of commands are input without an order

of execution. The apparatus selects the trimming command for execution in preference to other of the plurality of commands, regardless of an order of inputting the plurality of commands.

Independent Claim 41 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 39.

With the features of the independent claims discussed above, the present invention provides a system for interpreting and executing processing commands in a preferential order, when an execution order of such commands is not otherwise provided. More specifically, conventional program languages define a description order for processing commands, and thus processing systems simply follow the dictated order. The present invention addresses the processing of languages in which a processing order is not provided for the commands.

The Office Action acknowledges that Venable and Kawamoto et al. do not disclose execution of a trimming command prior to other commands such as flipping processing, rotation processing, and image aspect ratio maintaining processing. The Office Action cites Epstein et al. to teach this feature.

Applicants submit, however, that Epstein et al. merely describes the executing of a rotation or crop processing in a specified sequential order. Applicants submit that this document does not describe or suggest detecting processing commands, as recited in the

independent claims, and determining an execution order based on such detection. More specifically, with respect to independent Claims 20 and 38, Applicants submit that Venable, Kawamoto et al., and Epstein et al., taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of, in processing XML or HTML, detecting a trimming command and a command other than the trimming command, wherein the other command includes any of a flipping processing command, a rotation processing command, and an image aspect ratio maintaining processing command, and wherein the commands are processed such that the trimming command is executed prior to execution of the other command. With respect to independent Claims 39 and 41, Applicants submit that those documents also fail to describe or suggest the features of reading commands which are described in XML, HTML or SBG data, wherein the commands include at least one of a trimming command, an enlarging command, and a rotating command, and the commands are input without an order of execution of the commands being determined, and selecting the trimming command in preference to the other commands.

Tanimoto is merely cited in the Office Action as disclosing a descriptive language such as XML, SVG, and HTML. Applicants submit that this document fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Venable, Kawamoto et al., and Epstein et al.

The remaining claims in the application are dependent claims which depend

from the independent claims discussed above. Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable for reason similar to those as discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Applicants also request independent consideration of the claims inasmuch as they define additional features which further distinguish the claims from the cited art.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In view of the above amendments and remarks, the claims are now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Justin J. Oliver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,986

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
JJ/O/trf/lip

FCHS_WS 1766635v1